

Utopia for the Good in All of Us : Existential Hypotheticals and the Basis of Reality

By

Indana Simonde

ISBN : 9781698231488

Table of Contents

Introduction: On reading and judging writers	Page 3
Hypotheticals and existence	Page 7
Rhetorical Questions and points of note	Page 15
Notes from the original Manuscript: Total Writing System Revisions	
Hypotheticals and existence (Version I)	Page 26
Utopia for the Good in All of Us	Page 32

Introduction: On reading and judging writers

Being a writer, someone who directs the hopes, dreams and thoughts of any given individual, whether it is themselves or other lives outside of their own, something within the person changes as they travel through the world of words. Be it their diction, their narrative and grammatical syntax or simply the system of words which allow them, as an individual, to be understood in light of their mistaken frustrations (or well reasoned argument). As a writer, I have attempted to sow a fabrication of ideas and concepts, possibly my own, but inspired by those words of other people long since deceased.

The conversation(s) a person undertakes with the words of long since gone individuals allows all individuals the same freedom they now share. Freedom is such a concept that, where someone does not have or share the same conception of freedom, they are not necessarily free. So how do you gain freedom, and is it ever unequivocal, unchanging and all encompassing?

I as a writer have to console myself in my untrammelled isolation, in which, were I surrounded by well meaning individuals in my residence as with my place of worship, I would likely interact differently as a means to inspiring and showcasing the good in all men and women, children and further afield. That is to say, I have an idea of what is good to an individualistic ideal of normality. I also have an idea of what is good to an individualistic society (or nation of individuals). But where the line is not clear, there is still the division between and amongst individuals and societies that leads to social and national conflict, both within and amongst individuals.

You don't simply release yourself from bondage, enslavement or employment without repercussions (e.g. the first

person to quit a job on moral grounds or to fight against war as a conscientious objector would likely have been ostracised for going against the grain. But society rewarded that one person's suffering so as to allow many more individuals who didn't initially see the world in the same light to follow suit. Now ask, is joining the military a right or a role in the modern age? A duty or an honour?) whether they were societal chastisement and disrepute of a good reputation for friends and family or further afield?

None of us, the current generation(s) of living breathing men and women will likely know in totality what was happening socially, economically or environmentally when Aristotle decided to teach Socrates, or Socrates who taught Plato. Or Plato who likely inspired Machiavelli and all number of well reasoned authors and teachers. Though we might learn from their successes and frustrated failures, no one person was alive at the time of their writing to be able to say exactly why Aristotle (who is revered in the modern age) was tried by his peers with a view to gaining a verdict of *heresy* and *misleading the public (the youth)* of the day as with Xenophon.

For any one writer to focus all of their time and effort solely on the efforts of the good and how far society has come for people to manifest their nature as strong and good, using common sense highlights a bias. The voiceless, the weak and the depraved can be good, but it is a matter of allowing the good in all of us to become the reality of all of us. That is salvation. Serving all in the hopes that when Christ Almighty who reigns on high beside his fathers throne returns as he stated, we might all find reasons to be closer to him and his father, rather than hiding for all the wrong we might or might not have caused to come into existence (whether that is simply a thought or a word or a movement).

Previously I mentioned that there is no such thing as good or bad. Temptation from a human standpoint is flawed. If you tempt someone to do wrong, you have forsaken yourself by causing someone to do ill to their neighbour. If you cause pain to someone, you have forsaken yourself by causing someone to do ill to their neighbour (that is you have heaped two loads of

negativity on your head), but if you cause peer pressure (e.g. a teenager causes another teenager to drink or smoke – which one of them is in the wrong? Both, they both are in the wrong. One of them drinks, whilst the other assumes it is alright to watch them then struggle years later with mental ill health, substance misuse and drug addiction, which isn't always the case, but should never be the case).

The amount of times I have heard people say, “*I have an addictive personality!*” is crazy because, the amount of people who have a personality that you crave as though it were social lubrication is minimal if they don't know who you are in your deepest darkest cave and (or) recesses of your mind. Therefore there is no such thing as an addictive personality, rather it is the person saying the words who is addicted to someone else's personality, mannerisms and behaviours. It is a form of hero worship. Though the words are usually uttered in the instances where people then begin to lead one another astray in a reciprocal situation whereby they cannot stop causing harm to others. Jesus would have said, turn the other cheek. Let them. I say enough is enough. Don't let them cause harm to themselves, because if there is a war to be fought, it should be for the salvation of all life, not just one species or race or type of mammalian biped / quadruped or another.

The message is simple, believe in something that involves saving lives. Hospitals save lives. Educational infrastructure(s) usually educate one person and in so doing, a whole community is saved. This is because of the potential for someone to do good through their reasoning and ability to put into place their instrumental learning and skills and also to be able to apply this reasoning and learning to the salvation rather than the detriment of all men and women. That is the idea of an ideal in the modern age. *The concept of a Common Good.*

Ethics were founded centuries, millennia even, ago. In ages where the thought of a projectile nuclear explosion or even the implosion of a dead star were ideas far from sight. Laws our founding light (a guide when all things seem mostly dark) are the only thing that keeps humanity from tearing itself apart. So why should laws be respected as with religion?

What makes a person or a group of people good is the same thing that led to one stray Australopithecine humanoid from being banished by torchlight from what would have been its home. That home *may* have been destroyed by any number of meteor showers from a Martian terrain that lost its environment many millions of years ago. As a result this planet, our home was irrevocably transformed as a result.

Hypotheticals and existence

If you had the power of *God*, what would you do with that power? Would you feed the poor worldwide? Would you educate the poor as to the dangers of not caring? Would you clothe the poor? Would you class yourself as blessed for doing just that? Imagine being able to travel to other people's brains in thought and action as opposed to solely through the words you use, similar to the idea of astral projection (only with one key difference; rather than simply being a hypothetical telepathic union, imagine it was possible to actually and realistically travel to the minds of people outside of the self bridging the gap between hypothetical and realised use of *mind over matter* and (or) *technology* resonating at particular frequencies similar to using the brain as a form of sonar). Now imagine, and this is a tall order thus far; that the idea's, conceptions and processes that were derived *from* and equally *for* the self through countless years of self development, hard work and perceptual analyses of the environment around, became trapped as though held prisoner within the mind of someone else.

What would you do? Would you free the individual from any mental and emotional pain you found yourself or someone else suffering or would you allow yourself or someone else to torture themselves with regards to multiple instances of [themselves], that is, altering their reality such that each day they became a mirror image of the pre-programming you placed an emphasis upon as their daily burden in the form of a prayer. That is to say, where you as a person become so compartmentalised that your actual personality becomes the product of another person's brain through the regurgitated themes and ideas, ideologies and espoused trends as far as a train of thought is compared to that of bygone era's, likely it would not necessarily stand up to the test of time as with so many writers before.

That is just the issue, once it, the writers political economy, is in the mind of someone else, it becomes a part of their psyche, whether subconscious or otherwise. As such, based on whether the personal touch is applied such that there is a differentiation or acceptance of a message applied through thematic indicators such as the use of tone and language, someone unwittingly loses a piece of themselves such that they are now more in tune with the work delivered, whilst at the same time losing inspiration as a result of the ideals and aims of institutionalisation. The question then becomes one of not how but rather why someone would choose to implant or replace the value they currently face within their own lives with the value they assume other people have within their lives.

A high moral and ethical standard as a burden for most households stands as the education system and infrastructure is to blame for many a life going awry despite the nature of the idea of evil as a process, thus good is an equal and opposite process in which a distinction must be made. When thinking of the macro / micro inversions of a societal concept, the bold character of a benevolent God and religion, a thought I tried to keep carrying over in almost all of my books was a simple but multi-tiered effort. Namely *Can you teach honour?* As the first component of a question that is as intangible as it is difficult to answer. The second point on a moral and social philosophical form of reasoning was *is it possible to alter the demeanour of dishonour?* Perceptually, the truth is yes it is possible to apply spin to a question of honour, but in order to define the nature and role of this question within society at large, the question should then become, *is there such a thing as honour in the modern age, and where there is just that, what does **honour** mean?*

Other questions that are likely to be repeated as themes included in this series of books are highlighted as *why are soldiers and lawyers classed as honourable in comparison to the rest of society? How do I have a positive effect on other people? Is it possible to value myself and others at the same time? How do you overcome corruption of mind, body and soul or pollution of self? And also what does it mean to apply a societal standard that questions who a person is and why or how they become wor-*

thy in the eyes of benevolence with regards to being just, upright or moral in the eyes of others?

Whilst it is easy to spread and receive religious dogma at the cost of every righteous and unrighteous act within the lifetime of any given individual, the concept of a consciousness that allows for the concept of good and moral as well as unjust or evil and immoral is not so far from realised thinking. The world has not always been unjust and at one point in human civilisation, people stood up to the evils of unjust and unfair ideas and ideals (but the idea of strength in numbers is of course further reaching when you think of the macro to the micro level. e.g. a platoon of ants, a family of penguins or a shoal of fish through to a conglomeration of planets and stars within a galactic frontier). Even with knowledge of an interior world with internal neuroses, the planet as an entirety is not being overtly sexualised, it is only a minority of the earth's population that is being sexualised to the detriment of the rest of the earth's population, just as it is not everyone in the world who is being subjected to what some would call a religious trial of sorts. By this, I mean the many and varying instances of impoverishment whether that is of the self and potentially of others who may not necessarily have the most savoury of interests with regards to their demeanour towards all men and women, children otherwise.

Whilst I would define all men and women as roughly the same on average, therefore there would be a preponderance towards marring everyone with the same generalisation (namely that there is no such thing as Good or Bad people), there are always obvious exceptions to the mould. That is where the societal contract of which I had previously mentioned in *Ode to the Sea's song: of words and the accursed name* would come into play as the role of the individual in society post completion of educational attainment then becomes a little more specialised. I.e. without specifically stating that all members of society must have an education fit for the modern world(s), due to the radicalisation and dumbing down of society through mixed and not so overt symbolism, ideology and the use of specific instances of speech that are directed towards radicalised behaviours and mannerisms. Now, the question then must be asked what would happen to jails

where there were no such thing as a good or bad person and what would happen to law enforcement and judgement of any kind. Society on a global scale has evolved such that there are very few, though they do happen, instances where a child is not safeguarded such that they are able to complete a full high school education at the least. The struggle to fight to become more than simply a sponge or open palette such as an artists palette, but rather to become an individual with regards to the societal peer pressures associated with modern life and growing up in the modern world highlight the difficulties as stated in making sure that all people live good, wholesome and healthy lives and lifestyles. Examples of which might include a societal contract with the Department of Work and Pensions in which a requisite sum would be paid to the incumbent whereby they were able to at the least attempt to study towards a degree, even where they were not able to complete their requisite course of study due for any number of reasons (e.g. technical equipment and use of Information Technology, lack of resources and funds, mental or physical ill health or general inability despite guidance to complete their chosen course of study).

The aim would not be to develop solely intelligence within the common age as intelligence is innately bound by what a person allows into their mind. But rather, the aim would be to develop a *type of person* who regards their citizenship as valuable to the whole community, who develops their citizenship as a resource to be utilised by the whole community and as such perceives their lives and the lives of others as of value in the modern age.

The shroud of dogma in the modern age is where the difficulty of the modern age falls short of the glory of God and (or) the heavens in a world in which the idea's and ideology left by such individuals as Durkheim or Marx are slowly being eroded and pushed towards solely academic disciplines of philosophical or political economy in which people live their educated principles but fail to understand the significance of their work. Marx, like Trotsky, was about educating the masses of the lower classes (of whom he referred to as the proletariat) with a view to allowing the lower classes a level of opportunity in which they might

remove their societal emancipation and the shackles of a life in poverty as a result of a lack of education. The difficulties associated with the age were the same as the difficulties associated with the modern age. I.e. imagine a world in which you had spent your whole life fighting against a people from a distant land. Now imagine some super power or quasi-governmental entity waves a magic brush that states that all men are equally deserving of the same opportunity, free life, equality and education in a (de-weaponised) crime free and substance free environment.

Under ordinary circumstances, this would appeal to the good in people, but where you are gaining a profit from the instance of manufacture, counterfeit or even resale within an urban environment of the very same issues would you be pleased or displeased at the loss of income and earnings, based on relative societal growth? With and in all regards, the answer would be no, because greed is polluting men's minds and souls such that they are unable to continue with the obvious struggles of heart, mind and soul in a world that has no time for the very same struggles of so long ago. The apparent obviousness of history repeating itself is not for lack of a message, such as the need for a globe disarmed (despite it's unpreparedness), but rather similarities in the modern age between pre-1970s struggles for freedom from race, class, sex, culture and society through something as simple as the way and style of a persons dress which points towards how their mind works on a given day (which could alter to fit in line with an institution or within a specific aspect of a persons identity at any given point in time, or may not necessarily be a political or social statement).

At the same time, imagine your life embroiled in the court case of the century in which you are asked to stand up for yourself in front of an entire society and as such defend yourself for the role you played within that particular society. Now picture such people(s) as Christopher Columbus or Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln or Winston Churchill all on trial as with yourself for the crimes and perpetuated struggle(s) allowed still to persist on a day to day basis as with the crimes of Ernesto Che Guevara? I.e. where there is no relative idea of good, there is only the idea of bad and where that is the case, there can be no

good outside of the good that is provided to us through the desires and motivations of people with a greater level of self and societal awareness, who are in tune with the synergistic nature of society as it were. But along with this, the ideas of cultural values such as forgiveness, mercy, kindness and meekness which are attributed to people of a religious nature with their blessings and honour bound within the same idea's become a part of their identity through reasoned choice and value judgements. By value judgement's, the term is designed to highlight how an individual place value on the intrinsic role of their identified and accepted morals. Due to the temporal nature of our needs and wants through motivations, desires and hopes, perception of your life in the present is altered by the perceptions of both the voiceless and those with a voice through the civil and social architecture and strife associated with the same. Escapism within the modern age being attributed to the role of games machines in allowing and controlling mass swathes of the population ultimately in what should be a bloodless form of entertainment.

Unfortunately due to the population of the Earth (currently resting at approximately 7,000,000,000 for the individuals who have been counted in a census, there are bound to be some who have not found a route to being counted as a part of the very soul of something that is territorial about faith; not just land but faith), namely the borders of a country tell of a shared and divergent history in which any number of social and cultural atrocities which would not stand the test of legislation in a modern court are the issues that many fought against. So why is history always repeated inter-generationally? It's a simple thought, but as older generations of wise learned academics and the hardworking backbone of a nation slowly passes towards the annals of memory, so with it passes their individual learning and wisdom. Perhaps as a singular individual or as a group of individuals all as a result of the same intolerable warfare, intolerance, bigotry, violence and domestic abuse towards both adults and children of all ages and sexes. Life lessons's from the 1940s, 1950s, the freedoms hard won of the 1960s and 1970s and the economic booms of the 1980s and 1990s recessions are all a part of history yet to repeat themselves directly as more than simply an emotion. This

is because of the trends we place ahead of us as obstacles in which the obelisk blocking our path is the ideology in which we choose to accept or reject the obtainable and the unobtainable. Simply put, Utopia is a shift not just to alter attitude or class or creed or even the ideology of race and identity politics, but rather a motion to protect and heal a planet that is steadily becoming bare as a result of the resources that are mined on a day to day basis and considered normal.

If someone takes their life because they believe you were right, that is wrong. If someone takes their life because they believe I am right, that would be wrong. If someone takes their life because they believe in something, that would be wrong. If someone sacrifices their life because they believe that you are a messiah, that would be wrong.

A messiah, a messianic saviour, someone who is imbued with the power of a god, a deity amongst mortal men is someone who has seen something that the rest of the world are not privy to. It is the ideal of Peace. I live in a peaceful city, which is always at war with all people and itself, but in a peaceful manner within a peaceful population. So what is so bad about a state of relative calm on a global scale?

The power that resides in a rhetorical question is the same power that resides in all words. The only difference between all words and the words that are rhetorical is the diatribe that is annunciated, namely, if you as a well reasoned, mature and articulate individual are filled with common sense, wouldn't you do all you could to save all people(s) from harm, including someone who cannot spell or read or write, by giving them the skills to achieve more than the impossible. To be inherently good within the culture they are surrounded by?

So, how do you overcome the evil within any given person or people(s)? By speaking until they speak back politely about what it is that concerns them about this messianic revival of a saviour (or more than one saviour at the same time, like a team of roving saviours). In an age before the present, judges used to travel in England from court to court solving problems and judging the populous for crimes brought to their attention. Nowadays, people travel to court(s) to be tried and (or) convicted

for crimes they have committed. Simply trying a person for a crime does not solve the problem. Simply removing a person from society does not solve the problem. Driving a populous crazy with mixed messages in the media does not solve the problem. If it isn't the bad who becomes the new dictator, it is the good who is tried as bad, who later becomes the new dictator. But why support a dictator who will only bring you down until they too are eventually left beaten in a street by their own dictatee's?

Rhetorical Questions and points of note

Society is not wrong to keep attempting to improve and prove itself worthy of a deity. But what if we are alone.

Society is not wrong for trying to prove that a deity exists but what if we were wrong?

- Will the Earth's first colony on Mars hold the entirety of human knowledge in the form of the Internet?
- How will this idea revolutionise a world that has not seen life in our most evolved form (as at present)?
- What will they (future humanity) think of us 100 – 200 years from now as we continue to fight against the social ills of post-modernity?

Society was not wrong to crucify convicts. What if we were wrong in accepting it?

- How many family lines have lost a friend, a family member or someone close to them to execution?
- Why is it illegal in most Western States?
- What makes you think it should be legal / should not be legal?
- Why do you think that it is a civilised choice not to kill?
- Why do you think religion plays a role in society?
- Why do you think people don't listen to the role of religion?
- Is the pace of life too fast to change a persons life?
- Is the pace of life too fast to change your own perspective?
- If one person lays down a gun as opposed to raising a weapon who wins?
- For every life sacrificed at the cost of a militia or armed terrorist organisation, how much longer will the rest of the world wait for a messiah?
- If everyone is gone, buried or not so (as the case may be) and you are the only person with a gun, what will you do with you power, respect and money – as the only person on a planet formerly teeming to the brim with life and life forms?

Society was not wrong in competing in conquest and sharing the spoils of war. What if we are wrong for continuing in the legacy of destruction?

- So, you are a terrorist or a cartel. You have your gang members who all carry guns. Citizens of your new state drive in stolen cars, wear stolen clothes, use stolen money and crush the heels of societal progress and free choice. If you believe in God, look at the faces of the people you know. Go into the towns of the people you don't and ask them if they know you (?) and whether they like you as a person (?) whether they respect you without a gun (this is important as if you carry guns, you lose respect. If you suggest bombs or beheading's you lose respect. If you murder the people who run a country, in heart, spirit or mind, causing war, you lose respect for all the people who then have to follow their leaders to war against you. Now ask, for those who are Christian, what would Jesus do? And for those who are not, seek faith or look into the eyes of a young child and ask, what do you think they will be when they grow up?

Nb. being a soldier at the say so of a commander is a thing we all grow up to believe is normal. Ernesto Che Guevara walked into the United Nations and spoke about peace and the plight of his people after nearly starting a global confrontation for people of whom he did not know. What are you going to do to make you proud of the people you know, the people you don't and the people you are meant to serve? I am just a writer.

Society was not wrong to fashion new tools for war, new drugs for war and new ways of conducting warfare. What if it is us who are the final judges of ourselves and the nature of warfare?

- Fighting a war with anything but words is wrong for one reason;

“Sticks and stones may break a person's bones. Names never harm them..” anon

Unfortunately, due to the intensified nature of psychological warfare, names harm people who go on to become a terrorist organisation such as ETA, or ISIS or worse. If we can all sit down for long enough to free Gaza as a world of rational beings from enslavement for all intents and purposes, the soul of the world might unite. If we can start breaking down the historic walls we create to divide, then the future might be safe for us all. If we can see beyond intelligent finance and beginnings (anew) between countries (old) then we might start to lift the veil of public discourse such that public discourse is just that, public.

How would you plead if you had to answer for the last month of your life?

- I have tirelessly written to anyone and everyone in the hopes that it will be enough to change at the least one person's mind. Such that the modern nature of the ‘*shining new dawn*’ in which we all walk into Utopia together is one step closer as opposed to the dream(s) long argued of a yesterday we still grip tightly to as a civilisation. The mistakes of mankind are shared amongst the mistakes of yesterday's mankind. Tomorrow's mankind will not be the same as today. They are intelligent, prepared and have inherited a world that is lacking in resources, tools and machinery, they are facing economic disasters as well as political and environmental, social and legislative troubles.

How would you plead if you had to answer for the last two months of your life?

- Because of you, I believe I am saved. Because you are still alive and there is someone left to fight for. That's why I am saved. You may not agree with it. But I don't have to prove to anyone bar God that I tried my hardest, and yet, if I did, this would be how I would save myself.

How would you plead if you had to answer for the last four months of your life?

- After being pushed to work, to feed my kids and make money, I found that I struggled with more than I was aware of. But I am not the only person struggling. Hope is not a word for some and not others. It is a word we all live with and for. Because sometimes, faith in the better nature of others is not enough. You need hope in someone else's ability to rise above the mess and make something of themselves. This is salvation, which in turn is love.

How would you plead if you had to answer for the last year of your life?

- I worked harder than I have done throughout the entire course of my life. I looked after my kids whilst I could. I tried to look after my mental ill health and found that there was something that was missing my whole life. It was you.

How would you plead if you had to answer for your interaction with other people over the last few years of your life in light of the interactions with other people?

- On a personal front, I have battled with isolation, ignorance, bias and all the negative instances of misdirected negativity that a person can think of on a day to day basis. My life is shared amongst a global populous but not in specificity but rather in similitude. If people were to simply speak to one another in respect and with the same love that their parents were supposed to instil in them, the world would be at peace now because messengers from foreign lands would be greeted with gifts for their leaders. Resources would be shared and peace would reign. People would get the help they required and deserved. Not some, but all people would be supported in one way, shape or form.

Notes from the original Manuscript: Total Writing System Revisions

Hypotheticals and existence (Version I)

Imagine being able to travel to other people's brains in thought and action as opposed to solely through the words you use, similar to the idea of astral projection. Now imagine that you kept your personality in other people's brains, that is to say, imagine whilst the other person lost their ability to be themselves you had the ability to become them like a wolf in sheep's clothing. What would you do? Would you free the individual from any mental and emotional pain they were suffering from, or would you allow them to witness multiple instances of (themselves) that is, altering their reality such that each and every day, they became a mirror image of the preprogramming you placed an emphasis upon them. Simply put, do they become you, or do you become them, through their / your mannerisms or through their / your shared and controlled mannerisms?

Now imagine that same person commits a crime in your body, do you have the right to a free and speedy trial or would the trial cost the earth with every single person who ever did you a wrong on one side and every single person who ever did you a right turn on the other side. In theory, this would be the idea of heaven and hell, the concept of a consciousness that allows for the conception of good and evil. In which, you are able to commune with civilisation at large. But imagine now that there is a world beyond just the interior neuroses as demonstrated on a day to day basis by the very finest script writing known to mankind; in which if an apparent gun isn't brandished on television or there isn't the sexualisation of the entire planet in one way, shape or form the morals of old are lost.

The truth is, whilst there may not be such a thing as a good or a bad person due to the internal struggle(s) that any one person

undertakes in order to become the good inherent in all of mankind, that is, where someone would struggle and fight to cleanse their soul such that they can emulate Jesus Christ or any number of modern deities, the struggle is still the same regardless of which deity you believe in. Some are more about forgiveness, mercy, kindness and meekness. Others are about how you perceive your life in the present and then alter perceptions in the future. But in a world filled with 7,000,000,000 people, there are bound to be some who have not found god, and others who would devour the very soul of something or someone who is territorial about faith. Not land, but faith.

Imagine a world in which every child has a guardian angel, someone who watches over them and prepares them for the struggles and drama's that life might entail. Now imagine that that same guardian angel is not one but a large contingent of people trained to be safe-guarder's over the young infant until such times as their actual guardians (parents or foster carers or someone with parental responsibility) was able to guide them such that the positive, the very good they do might lead all citizens, not just one or two people towards Utopia in one simple movement, like a shift not just in attitude, or race or class or creed, but rather in a motion towards protecting and healing the Planet. No one landmass, regardless of nuclear or other capabilities is supreme above all other landmasses, so why should one people be chosen over another people(s). That is to say, could our common conception of the idea of religion be wrong based on the idea that humanity has always competed with itself and generally anything that it can compete with. Be that as it may, the struggles of survival in a completely urbanised environment with it brings a whole new series of challenges that alter our ability as individuals to see beyond a mere narrative or story and read between the lines.

Imagine you revolved around an image of your own making, a lifestyle and culture totally and unequivocally designed around yourself, your life and loves, and the people you wish to be involved in your life. What happens to all the people you don't want in your life? The apparent undesirables or unobtainable and untouchables. Nothing, they remain the same

as they are until the narrative in between their ears changes such that it then becomes time for them to do the impossible, to grow up, mature and change their own lives until other people are able to do the same.

If your mind was a place of work, such as an office block or collection of conglomerate individuals who all worked together with a view to a common goal, then that would be a feat of miraculous achievements. Now picture this, Jesus Christ was a doorway, he was omnipresent as with God and he was everyone everywhere at all times, as with God. What separates Jesus from his father? The actual existence of a conscience such that the unthinkable is unthinkable (namely God in human form was known as the Son of Man in a format that humanity would be able to understand relative to other sentient creatures on the planet). So here is a simple question if you will;

If you had the power of God, what would you do with it?

Would you feed the poor worldwide?

Would you educate the poor as to the dangers of not caring?

Would you clothe the poor?

Would you class yourself as blessed for doing just that?

Perhaps, as a singular individual, a person with the ability to reason and think for themselves, taught as a result of generation upon generation upon generation of successful, and not so successful governments and policies. Every generation we as a civilisation spike ourselves. We hire soldiers, of whom a proportion of which are spies sent to complete and blame 'alien' nations for the role of espionage only for war to become a modern tool of operations in which we kill 'aliens' with a view to modern warfare as a call of the duty of a pixelated through to modern tour of duty on multiple fronts. Where there were a conscience which we each shared as an innate skill, we would all be nice people, not just to people we liked, but rather nice people.

The heart and the soul of the world is slowly dying, where people are unable to see the direct effect of countless generations of warfare, intolerance, bigotry, violence and domestic abuse

towards adults and kids. We all learnt from the morals and values of the 1940s and 1950s through the individuals who survived those era's. We all learnt from the morals and values of the 1960s and 1970s of which the individuals who survived those era's appeared on television more regularly with increased upward social mobility throughout the world. The 1980s saw the advent of television, movie and radio cross correlation on major events and issues that were of national and international importance. And the 1990s-2000s saw the advent of multi-talented individuals with an ability to speak to the heart of children, adolescents and adults alike through well written and promoted scripts that highlighted the better nature of the soul of humanity. So the question is unchanged, blasphemy and religiosity aside;

If you had the power of God, what would you do with it?

Because, the world has forsaken God and chosen the machinery of war and power of fighting wars without a direction or a cause apart from the furtherment of a state or a group of states. If you had the power of God, the whole world would be watching you and your only mission on Earth would be to emulate Jesus. So Educate people, provide for their healthy growth and remove the damaging instances of warfare such that when the End of Civilisation comes round and we as a combined species are judged, not as the embodiment of one or two individuals but as every single creature that has ever and will likely ever exist, we can all say we tried, our hardest.

Would you save every soul? How would you do that whilst fighting amongst the general populous of a nation that may not be trained in the same media, language and general skills for operating on a global theatre as your own? Would you require **guns** or **no guns**? And why do you think that the no guns theorem is a better route to saving lives worldwide?

Would you feed the poor worldwide?

This in modern history has been more of a choice than a matter of absolute urgency. Divergent trends in transforming the

face(s) of developing nations such that they are no longer dependent on their neighbours is one thing. But there is a difference between the need for murder in a civilised age, and the need for murder in a civilised nation. We live in an age where people can learn and read, count and speak with one another in common languages or at the least phonemes. So how many different languages does it take to say, "I am hungry?" before someone will realise, there are people without. They are the product of centuries of mistrust, neglect and improper understanding of a simple few lines. But then again, the development of the printing press and advancement of civilisation took an age to develop, so why not let people suffer on their own until they surrender, hungry, starved and alone? Humanity is a word, being a human being is just a phrase. Actually doing something positive for a change is more important than simply misunderstanding a persons words or their or your mistrust of one another.

Would you educate the poor as to the dangers of not caring?

If you don't educate someone as to the dangers of not caring about themselves and others, you fail to notice that it is your own enrichment which allows you to be the voice of the world (if only for a mortal lifetime).

Would you clothe the poor?

What can you say to the child who only has one outfit? Who only has no pairs of shoes. Who doesn't know what a clean pair of underwear is? What would you say to the future of humanity, knowing that they haven't brushed their teeth in months if not years, let alone having no idea what a dentist is? Who would you complain to if that person doesn't have parents?

Would you class yourself as blessed for doing just that?

I have always supported the troops (the people who carry the guns that should be thrown away). I have always been

fascinated with planes, trains and helicopters. But just because I show an interest in physics or aerodynamics, as a member of a public that already has, I have no interest in building bombs or nuclear power stations. Rather, keeping the lights on in area's that have never seen a lamp post are a necessity. The power struggle that is exhibited by cartels and syndicates, rings and power circles or vacuums is pretty awful and highlights a lack of faith in the people they are there to defend. So, all war breaks out and the world is destroyed; who creates the new Utopia? The marines with the bombs? The infantry with the guns? The navy with the boats?

And who leads? The marines with the biggest guns? the infantry with the even bigger guns? Or some amalgamation between an air force or a navy? Or will it be the people(s) choice?

Utopia for the Good in All of Us

If every man, woman and child was viewed as Good, as opposed to how society viewed Bad people, the message that Good always wins in the end would be the equivalent of a vote for god right? But what if transforming a person from Bad to Good was all the struggle ever really was. Removing hate from a persons life, such that the lie that has been repeated time and again would no longer be resident in a persons life (culture, syntax or art, including speech and action), is a far more overdrawn and protracted process than initially it might appear. Simply stating, I need religion or I need to change my life is something that will not happen overnight. As one person I could complain, but complaining will not help console someone who is in pain. Neither will destroying someone else's life, or their recourse to a future, regardless of whether people believe in the message or not.

Utopia involves an entire global populous. Space as a dream involves an entire global populous, otherwise, there is really no reason for the leaving group to ever return; leaving Earth as a fairground for anyone willing to work towards a shared future. But is that the human response to a system of built up communications infrastructures, shared narratives in history or friendships and relationships between nations and peoples? Do we all hate one another so much that we would push each other towards differing corners of space, because, like the world of the late 1960s, one nation (or more than one nations achievements) became a global frontier of achievement from the smallest bolt to the initial activation of a computer in Mission Control. From the guy who nobody remembers (who cleaned the toilets) to the lady who always sat and had a sandwich whilst reading the news, alone.

What does value in the modern age actually mean? If someone asked you how much a life is worth, how would you reply?

A life is worth so much more than mere words. Sometimes it's harder to show this through your words or mine, but a life is worth so much more than people give it credit. The world is old, so are genes and to assume that the person who watches Zombie night (a fictitious group of actors pretending to be the immortal undead with a view to defining human curiosity through the very medium that drives people insane so as to allow people to cope with the pace of change in the modern lifetime is just one way of crying out for help). Why should someone have to eat fake humans, or real humans or horses or dogs or any number of distasteful thoughts just so as to prove a psychological point. Who prays for the salvation of the lowly actor when somewhere on the other side of the planet, someone is consumed because of lack of education, faith, hope or support from a community?

There was a man who travelled to an island, he wanted to do what all evangelical Christian's in the end do. He travelled by boat to an island, and attempted to teach the inhabitants faith. He never returned home.

Proof